COMPINENTIAL **UUITI IDENTINE**

Approved For Release 2000/09/07 : CIA-RDP62S00346A00010@1/10002-3\

Assistant Mirector for Descards and Reports

19 **Ecomber** 1993

TMU,: Chief. Economic Research. ON Chief, Materials Division, GAR

Consecuts on Sowiet Grain Production Statistics

- On 15 December 1955, Alirushchev gave a report on agriculture to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The speech gave absolute data on grain production in 1952, 1953, and 1978 and an angual everage for 1949-1953 inclusive. This was the first time in about 20 years that there has been my anamacement of chaptute grain production for the whole USBR on a barn yield basis. I thought you might be interested in a comparison of these and certain other derived figures with estimates made by the food and Agriculture Eranch.
- With the data given us in the Khrushchev speach, we can also develop claimed grain production figures for 1950, 1951, 1954, 1955. and 1956 by applying to the Khrushchev data an index which appeared in Aurodnoje Khozyayetvo, UNSR, 1956. We can develop a claimed figure for 1957 by using a relative given as in the 1957 plan fulfillment report. The results, together with H/AD estimates for the same years, are given below. I would like to note that each of the M/AC estimates was made shortly after the end of the crop year to which it applied, and is not second guessing based on leter information, for until the Khrushchev speech we had no such information.

Grain Freduction in the USSA

(Million metric tons)

Icar	Soviet Claim	M/AG Petim-te
1990	S €	95
1951	80	
1950	92	e de la companya de l
1953	53	3
1954	36	97
1955	3.07	103
1956	229	115
1957	104	190
1350	CONFIDENTIAL CONTINUES	123 (preliminary)

PERMAL

Approved For Release 2000/09/07: CIA-RDP62S00346A000100110002-3

SUBJECT: Comments on Soviet Grain Production Statistics

- 3. Some fear has been expressed at times that K/AG estimates of Soviet grain production tend to be highly conservative, and that they probably understate the actual Soviet schiavement. It will be noted, however, that except in 1956 and 1956, the K/AG estimates agree closely with Soviet claims.
- actimate is more apparent than real. The situation in 1956 was a highly unusual one. We actually credit the WER with a bern yield of 124 million tons, we compared with the Soviet claim of 129 million tons. In that year, however, the Soviets suffered extraordinary post-hervest grain losses because of the inability of the Soviets to handle the basper hervest in the New Lands. We therefore reduced the 126 million tons to 115 million tons to allow for the extraordinary losses, and to make the 1956 estimate comparable with that of previous years. We are confident that substantial losses in fact occurred, and that Ehrushobev's figure does not take them into second.
- 5. For 1956, the figure which M/AG has been prepared to accept up to now is some 15 million tone less then the claim made by Thrushchev. It must be said at the cutset that the Khrushchev claim falls within the range of creditability; 1950 was a good agricultural year in the Soviet Union and we have stated on a number of occasions that the grain herwest would probably set a new record. Monetheless, we would almost certainly have finally settled upon a figure lower than the one assounced by Shrushchev and the Ehrushchev claim must be considered surprising. For one thing, on 29 August, Muchitalinov, Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, stated that the USSR would have a grain barvest of "not less than 131 million tons. Even with the not less than clause, it is quite unusual for the Soviets to make this conservative a statement as late as the end of August about a horvest whose ultimate size is claimed to be 139 million tome. Moreover, subsequent to August, the usual boosting which accompanies a record harvest was complemently absent from the press. In addition, Soviet press articles during the harvesting season discussed the serious hervesting difficulties caused by unsessonal rain-Eall in the New Lands. Our own weather information establishes that there was in fact unseconal rainfall which must have happered the harvest. Prior to the occurrence of these wether difficulties, we were thinking in terms of a harvest of 130 million tons. Finally, in his speech, Khrumbohev cleimed an average corn yield for the USSA of about 35 bushels per sore in 1950. This comperes with an awarage for the El for the years 1947 to 1956 (the decade having the highest corn yield in US history) of some 39 bushels per sore; caring this period, the lowest UE yield was 23.4 bushels per acre in 1947, and the bighest 45.4 bushels per agre in 1956. In 1957 the Us yield was 56.8 bushels per acre. In the light of these US statistics, the Sevict claim of an average yield of 35 bushels is considered Mighly suspect. Recease of their lack of a corn belt

CONFIDENTIAL DP62S00346A000100110002-3

SUBJECT: Comments on Soviet Grain Production Statistics

exemparable to care, and their lack of saitable hybrid corn, the Soviets should certainly not be doing as well relative to us as the Khrushchev claim implies. According to Soviet sources, the only corn production data included in the over-ell grain production index is that for ripe cars and impature emailed cars converted to a grain base. We have reason to wonder, however, in the light of the relatively high foviet claim, whether the conversion is made accurately and whether the Soviets might not also be including corn in the form of green folder.

6. This means that we must do considerably more thinking about the 1950 harvest claim. All we can do at the present time is to present the comparative figures for 1950 shown above and to suggest some of the reasons sky we are uneasy about the Bowlet claim.

25X1A9a

distribution:

Orig. and 1 -n AD/RR 2 - Ch/E' 2 - D/M

de: SYNG CSU